DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 116 652 52 IR 002 893

AUTHOR Kittel, Dorothy A.
TITLE Trends in State Library Cooperation.
INSTITUTION Bureau of Libraries and Learning Resources (DHEW/OE), Washington, D.C.
REPORT NO DHEW-OE-75-21003
PUB DATE 75
NOTE 12p.
AVAILABLE FROM Superintendent of Documents, U.S. Government Printing Office, Washington, D.C. 20402 (Stock No. 017-080-01467-0; $0.40)

EDRS PRICE MF-$0.76 HC-$1.58 Plus Postage
DESCRIPTORS *Federal Legislation; *Interagency Cooperation; Interstate Programs; *Library Cooperation; *Library Networks; Public Libraries; Regional Libraries; School Libraries; Special Libraries; State Libraries; State of the Art Reviews; University Libraries
IDENTIFIERS Library Services Act; Library Services and Construction Act; LSA; LSCA; *Multitype Library Cooperation

ABSTRACT

This nine page pamphlet describes the development of such federal library legislation as the Library Services Act (1956), the Library Services and Construction Act (1964), the Elementary and Secondary Education Act, the Higher Education Act, and the Medical Library Assistance Act (1964). The effect of this legislation on new forms of intertype library cooperation such as regional library associations, interstate library networks, and area library councils is examined. The feasibility of establishing a national network is evaluated. (NR)

****
* Documents acquired by ERIC include many informal unpublished *
* materials not available from other sources. ERIC makes every effort *
* to obtain the best copy available. Nevertheless, items of marginal *
* reproducibility are often encountered and this affects the quality *
* of the microfiche and hardcopy reproductions ERIC makes available *
* via the ERIC Document Reproduction Service (EDRS). EDRS is not *
* responsible for the quality of the original document. Reproductions *
* supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made from the original. *
****

ED116652

DHEW Publication No. (OE) 75-21003

TRENDS IN STATE LIBRARY COOPERATION

by
Dorothy A. Kittel
Office of Libraries and Learning Resources
Office of Education

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION & WELFARE
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION

THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY.

IR 002 893

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF
HEALTH, EDUCATION, AND WELFARE
Caspar W. Weinberger, Secretary
Virginia Y. Trotter, Assistant Secretary for Education

Office of Education
T. H. Bell, Commissioner

TRENDS IN STATE LIBRARY COOPERATION

By 1975, each of the 50 States and some of the outlying territories established intrastate telecommunication networks accessible to all types of libraries within the State and with the potential capability of communicating with networks of other States. Five years ago this was not true. While this is only one type of intrastate library cooperation, it is the type most commonly found.

The initial impetus for this and other types of cooperative activities may have been the report of the American Library Association's Committee on Federal Relations* to the Association's Council in 1936. Based on several years of study and investigation of Federal grant-in-aid programs in education, agriculture, and highways and of the contemporary library scene, the committee concluded that "A system of permanent annual Federal grants-in-aid to libraries is essential to the complete and adequate development of library service throughout the United States."[1] While the committee directed its attention to the rationale and structure of Federal aid to States for the development of public library services, it recognized the need for stimulation and assistance for library services in the public elementary and secondary schools and in public institutions of higher education. These institutions were seen as "essentially a part of any general plan for complete service to all the people, and in this sense, educational libraries belong to the 'public library system' of any State."[2] Federal grants-in-aid would be essential to assist in a general program of library cooperation and in the coordination of library resources on a regional and national scale. However, the committee opposed the use of Federal subsidies to establish a single unified pattern of library service throughout the country. It saw the States, the local communities, and the Nation all contributing to the development of a cooperative plan for the improvement of library service. "The function of the federal library agency is to oversee the distribution of federal grants-in-aid and to assure the efficient use of federal appropriations through the exercise of reasonable supervisory powers. The state library agency is responsible for the formulation of state plans of library development and for the distribution of federal grants to the libraries in counties, cities and towns. Finally, the local units, as is now the case, have full authority in the administration of their libraries and also, as now, are responsible for the success or failure of library service."[3]

* Members serving on the Committee were: Charles H. Compton, St. Louis Public Library; James T. Gerould, Princeton University Library; Carleton B. Joeckel, University of Chicago Graduate Library School; Harriet C. Long, Oregon State Library; Milton E. Lord, Boston Public Library; Mary U. Rothrock, Tennessee Valley Authority; Clarence E. Sherman, Providence Public Library; Forrest B. Spaulding, Des Moines Public Library; and Louis R. Wilson, University of Chicago Graduate Library School, Chairman.

In its discussion of Federal assistance for library cooperation and coordination of library resources, the committee identified some of the areas needing investigation:

- storage and distribution of library materials, including unused and surplus materials and the distribution of duplicates;
- the photographic reproduction of newspapers and other research materials;
- coordination of research materials through agreements concerning fields of responsibility;
- development of special collections;
- organization of regional bibliographic centers and of document and newspaper centers;
- development of an integrated system for interlibrary loan service for general readers as well as scholars.[4]

The recommendations of this committee did not result in the immediate passage of Federal grant-in-aid legislation. However, as the economic conditions of the 1930's began to improve and the depression approached its end, the concepts in the report were widely discussed among library leaders; the ALA then began to search for ways to implement the recommendations. It began to sponsor specific proposals for Federal grants to the States to be used for local library services, attached to bills for Federal aid to State school systems. But World War II required enormous outlays of Federal funds for military purposes, and the educational groups failed to obtain legislation for Federal aid.[5]

After the war, the leadership of the library profession focused again on the need for Federal financial assistance for library development. However, instead of seeking broad general aid, an attempt was made to produce "a bill of some kind that would be specific enough in its objectives to be comprehensible, glamorous enough to stir the imagination, and limited enough in scope and time to avoid mass antagonism and competition with the National Education Association in its drive for federal aid to education."[6]

Library legislation in the form of the "Public Library Demonstration Bill" was introduced in the House on March 12, 1946, by Emily Taft Douglas and in the Senate by Lester Hill. Finally, on June 19, 1956, the Library Services Act (LSA) was signed into law by President Eisenhower. It should be noted that over the years, in testimony before committees of both Houses of Congress, witnesses stressed that the provision of library services to rural areas without library services or with inadequate library services would "open up enormous library resources to these areas. Librarians have worked out cooperative methods of lending their books and files and other materials to such a degree that there can be a constant flow of valuable library materials to these rural areas once the outlets are established for their utilization."[7]

As experience was gained in administering the Library Services Act, the provision limiting the use of Federal funds to rural areas with less than 10,000 population was recognized as inhibiting the development of a coordinated library program that would bring about maximum availability and

utilization of library resources and services. Bills were introduced in both Houses of Congress to overcome this limitation. The bills proposed to remove the rural limitation on public library programs, to provide Federal financial assistance for public school libraries and college and university libraries, and to provide Federal funds for library training institutes similar to the National Defense Education Act (NDEA) institutes for teachers of science, mathematics, and foreign languages. It became recognized that the growing need for information and education for all our people and the rapidly expanding body of knowledge made good libraries essential from the elementary school through adult education, and that a coordinated program of library development was needed.

The Library Services and Construction Act (LSCA) (P.L. 88-269) was signed into law Feb. 11, 1964. It amended the original rural program to include grants for public library services to urban areas as well as rural areas and funds for public library construction.

Although the LSCA did not specifically mandate interlibrary cooperation, the thrust of larger units of service for public libraries and of centralization of many functions begun under LSA (i.e., technical processing, reference and research services, shared specialized personnel, and cooperative book and other media acquisition, storage and loan) was carried forward by including urban public libraries in the developing systems. In the air were proposals for Federal assistance to public elementary and secondary school and academic libraries, and for a coordinated program of library development. There was recognition of the interdependence of libraries of all kinds and of the need for simultaneous development of all libraries and the training of librarians in order to effect the most efficient and effective improvement of library service.

In many States there was an increased awareness of "the community of interests" among libraries of different sizes and types. Many States recognized the need for broad-scale, statewide planning for library development. For example, Rhode Island, based on a statewide study of all types of libraries, passed a comprehensive library law in May 1964 which provided for the creation of a Department of State Library Services, and State grants-in-aid to local, regional, and statewide resource center libraries, including grants for public library construction. Other States undertook various types of surveys to encourage service programs which would coordinate the services and resources of all libraries.[8]

Then, in 1965, legislation providing Federal assistance for school, academic, and medical libraries was enacted: The Elementary and Secondary Education Act, the Higher Education Act, and the Medical Library Assistance Act. There was no legislative provision for coordinating the activities carried out under these Acts or requiring coordination with activities carried out under the Library Services and Construction Act which was to be terminated June 30, 1966. However, as was expected, legislation to extend the LSCA was introduced in the Congress in January 1966, and on July 19 an expanded and amended LSCA was signed into law. It authorized three new programs, among them, title III, Interlibrary Cooperation, "for the establish-

ment and maintenance of local, regional, state or interstate cooperative networks of libraries, including state, school, college and university, public and special libraries and information centers to provide maximum effective use of funds in providing services to all users."[9] It required each State to appoint a Statewide Advisory Council which was to be broadly representative of professional library interests and library users.

During the first year of funding under title III, the States were limited to using Federal funds for planning purposes. Surveys were the most frequently reported activities in fiscal year 1967. Primary areas of concern were: (1) determining library resources in the State that could be utilized under this title and (2) evaluating methods of cooperation among different types of libraries to make library materials more readily available to all persons in an area.

In fiscal year 1968 when funds for program activities were made available, 50 of the eligible 56 States and territories participated in the LSCA title III program. Program activities included:

1. identification and location of library resources available in State or region;
2. establishment or expansion of interlibrary loan and reference networks to include all types of libraries and information centers and, in some States, the Regional Medical Libraries and State Technical Services Act information centers;
3. establishment or expansion of processing centers using modern technology and equipment; and
4. coordination of the acquisition of materials among types of libraries within a geographic area.

These types of activities were continued in the next fiscal years. Some LSCA title I programs in cooperative networks merged with title III programs.

Interstate activities also became more evident. States affiliated with regional library associations have used some title III funds to partially support activities such as the Pacific Northwest Bibliographic Center which serves Alaska, Idaho, Montana, Oregon, and Washington; and the Rocky Mountain Center for Bibliographical Research, which has received support from Arizona, New Mexico, Colorado, Utah, Wyoming, Nebraska, South Dakota, and North Dakota. The States in the Southwestern Library Association (Arkansas, Louisiana, Texas, New Mexico, and Oklahoma) established the Southwestern Library Interstate Cooperative Endeavor which provides a formal structure for developing activities in the areas of continuing education for library personnel and in the use of modern technology for bibliographic control of library materials. In the southeastern region some States used title III funds to support the Southeastern Library Association's intensive study of libraries in each of the States as a preliminary step to identifying needs that might be met more effectively by multi-state, regional cooperative activities. The New England Library Information Network serves the six New England States and is in the process of reassessing its goals, purposes, and activities. A group of States in the upper Midwest has been studying the network

needs in Indiana, Illinois, Wisconsin, Minnesota, and North Dakota to determine if they should establish a regional network.

Each of the States designed its plan for title III based on its perception of the needs in that State and the resources available to it that would enable it to move toward reaching its objectives of establishing and maintaining cooperative networks of libraries. In some States the mere bringing together of academic, public, school, and special librarians and library users to discuss the potentials of intertype library cooperation was a major achievement. In Florida, for example, in the first year of title III activities the State Library contracted with the Florida Library Association to sponsor a conference on interlibrary cooperation and to identify activities that should and could be undertaken. In succeeding years funds were used to purchase equipment to inaugurate data transmission between the Business, Science and Technology Division of the Orlando Public Library and the Technical Information Division of the University of Florida Libraries. The teletype network was expanded to include more public and university libraries. The State Library became the central screening agency for interlibrary loan requests from school and public libraries to the university libraries and the Florida Health Center Library. In the 1970 annual report the Florida State Library stated, "Title III programs have paved the way for greater interaction between public, special and academic libraries. The interlibrary loan network has traffic both ways. . . .The network has emphasized the fluid resource concept. . . . Cooperation between school and public libraries is increasing also, especially at the state level where joint meetings frequently encompass new projects, philosophies, trends." "Interaction" has continued and has led to such actions as planning, preparing, and publishing a Florida Union List of Serials, the development of a depository system for State documents to improve access for all types of libraries, and continuing study and evaluation of cooperative planning.

In other States intertype cooperative activities were undertaken more rapidly. Arizona, for example, using title I funds had contracted with the Arizona State University, Bureau of Educational Research and Development, to conduct a comprehensive survey of library and information services, resources, and needs of the State. The advisory committee for the survey was made up of representatives from all types of libraries and library education. When the title III planning money became available in 1967, the State Library again contracted with the Bureau for a survey with recommendations for implementing title III. Thus, cooperative projects were being developed on the basis of the findings of the survey. In 1968, after publication of the survey, a series of workshops was held in different areas of the State for librarians, trustees, governmental officials, and lay people to publicize the findings of the survey. In FY 1969 Arizona reported that "Title III had been very fruitful in Arizona. Communications networks and union lists have been created and cooperative patterns all set which are greatly enhancing library services in our State. One cooperative venture failed; however, even from this unsuccessful experiment a great deal of knowledge was gained." In succeeding years the title III program has included:

- demonstrations designed to involve the community more meaningfully in school and public library services, with the school library offering its resources at night to all citizens in the community and special programs to preschool children and their mothers in the neighborhood;
- updating the union list of serials and expanding it to include holdings of some libraries in Nevada and New Mexico;
- a joint project with the California State Library to provide full library services to geographically remote areas in Yuma County, Ariz., and Imperial County, Calif.;
- continuing support of the Western Interstate Commission on Higher Education project of continuing education for library personnel.

In 1974, with the development of regional library systems, known as Library Area Reference Service Systems (LARSS), the State Library reported that "The Channeled Arizona Information Network has developed into an efficient interlibrary loan and reference network where nearly 7,000 author/title requests were received with 78% hits and an average turn-around time of 6.8 days. Nearly 900 subject/reference requests were received and 100% answered."

Other States have moved in similar directions but with slightly different approaches to improving library and information services. In Indiana, for example, the General Assembly established a Library Service Authority to encourage libraries of all types to coordinate their activities and to enable local authorities having library responsibilities to join together in a municipal corporation to provide necessary services. By the end of fiscal year 1974 five Area Library Service Authorities had been established.

There seems to be a new breed of library service animal rearing its head in the States, nurtured by State library and local planning and LSCA title III, Interlibrary Cooperation: the area library council. While there are variations within the breed, they share some common attributes:

1. The library authorities within a geographic area of some States have recognized that the needs of their clienteles cannot be met adequately by one single type of library; that to do so requires coordinated efforts by all those responsible for providing library and information services within the area.
2. They have organized into library councils in order to facilitate the efforts of individual institutions to undertake programs of coordination.
3. The councils, with membership from all types of libraries in the area, meet regularly to:
   - discuss problems in serving their clienteles;
   - identify the strengths and weaknesses of their resources in materials, staff, or facilities;
   - explore possible methods of solving problems by cooperative efforts;
   - design proposals that might help solve the problems—both those

that require additional resources and those that can be accomplished by reassigning responsibility for sharing present resources to meet client needs.

What are some of the factors that have brought forth the new area library council?

- The Library Services and Construction Act Amendments of 1965 required the State library agencies to appoint advisory councils for each of the new programs. The law specified that the Advisory Council on Interlibrary Cooperation be representative of all types of libraries and information centers, thus mandating a mechanism for bringing together academic, public, special, school, and State librarians to develop plans for the use of funds made available under this program.
- The Higher Education Act of 1965, under title IIA, encouraged academic libraries to form consortia and jointly plan for the acquisition of library materials.
- The Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965, title II, School Library Resources, stimulated more comprehensive planning for the use of materials purchased by the funds made available. In some States, title II encouraged the creation of multi-school district library/media service units.

These 1965 laws provided vehicles for persons responsible for library services to move ahead toward the goal of developing coordinated networks of libraries and information centers. However, while vehicles were provided there were no road maps, and people were moving in varying directions. Then, in 1970, the U.S. Office of Education and the American Library Association sponsored a Conference on Interlibrary Communications and Information Networks (CICIN) which was charged to "explore and study the implications that would follow if a network of library and information centers were established in the United States."[10] At the same time, the Library Services and Construction Act was amended to require the States to develop a "comprehensive five-year program which identifies a State's library needs and sets forth activities to be taken toward meeting the identified needs supported with the assistance of Federal funds made available under this Act."[11] The law also required the States, in their long-range programs, to "set forth effective policies and procedures for the coordination of programs and projects supported under this Act with library programs and projects operated by institutions of higher education or local elementary or secondary schools and with other public or private library services programs."[12] Here was the impetus for statewide coordinated planning for library and information services—for the States to develop their road maps.

There were, of course, other factors, some local, some regional, some national, that have encouraged breaking through the road blocks to interlibrary cooperation. But, in my opinion, those described above are the most significant. One of the observations made by the CICIN director after editing the Proceedings was:

> Finally, "social engineering" is required to overcome many of the obstacles to network progress. There seems to be little doubt that technology can aid the process, but the fundamental requirement is to *motivate institutions to develop new patterns of organization* that will permit consortia and networks to operate effectively. Conference discussions made it very clear that a monolithic network structure imposed from the top down will not work. Meaningful network development requires grassroots motivation and grassroots support.[13]

The network configuration envisioned by the CICIN Network Organization Working Group included "a formalized structure which interrelates existing and future libraries and information centers, involving the organization of these units at the local, state, regional and national levels."[14] It also saw the need for a coordinating agency at each hierarchical level.

The area library councils have the potential of serving as the coordinating agency at the local level, enabling smaller libraries to draw on resources of larger libraries and making the resources of libraries with specialized functions accessible through organized patterns of referral. The councils may also serve as nodes in the general purpose statewide network. Through some of their component parts they may, in addition, have access to the special networks, such as the automation programs of the Library of Congress, the National Library of Medicine, and the National Agricultural Library.

A review of the long-range and annual programs submitted in late 1972 by the 50 States as required by the Library Services and Construction Act reveals that 19 States had as a specific long-range goal the development of some form of area library council; of these, 10 had a project in their fiscal year 1973 annual programs leading toward reaching this goal. In 15 States this goal was implied in the long-range program, and four States had projects in their fiscal year 1963 annual programs.

The Illinois Regional Library Council, which has more than 260 members and serves the Chicago metropolitan area, is probably the most advanced of the area councils now in existence. It began the development of a 5-year plan of service in 1973 after being incorporated as a non-profit Illinois corporation in 1972. Its mission, as stated in the 5-year plan is "... to coordinate activities of the member libraries in cooperative ventures, in order to assure improved access to the materials and information in all the libraries and information centers within the area of the Council for all residents of that area."[15] Council members identified areas in which planning was required: users, non-users, and the unserved; personnel; acquisitions; tools; collections; information services to clientele; facilities; operations; finances; cooperation, education, attitudes; and communications, promotion, marketing. The results of planning efforts culminated in the development of goals and subgoals in each area. Once the council membership accepted the mission, goals, and subgoals and placed them in priority order, the planning areas became activity areas. For activity areas, a general goal and subgoals were developed and long range and short range activities were specified. There is provision for a process of continuous review, evaluation, and further strengthening of

the plan, which the council considers as a document in process, never to be completed.

In these States interlibrary cooperative activities have changed in emphasis and focus. From single purpose projects involving more than one type of library, such as the expansion or establishment of telecommunications network for interlibrary loan and reference services, the development of centralized technical processing centers, the development of union catalogs and lists, and surveys of library resources and needs, these States have moved to projects which require types of libraries within a geographic area to *cooperatively* assess needs, *jointly* develop plans and programs to meet needs, and *jointly* evaluate their efforts. This requires a commitment from each type of library represented on the council to see itself in relation to the total community and to the world of library and information services.

SUMMARY

From this brief review of intertype library cooperative activities it seems apparent that librarians and users of information have devised many strategies and systems to get the information they need. There is great concern about the need for a "national network" and for compatibility among the various State and regional networks. However, it seems clear that networks and other cooperative activities are being developed at the local, State, and regional levels to meet specific needs at those levels. It is doubtful that a "national network" can be designed to meet the State and local requirements for all kinds of information transmission. The national network must be designed to overarch the State and regional networks. It must allow for diversity among political entities as well as among subject specializations such as law, medicine, art, and agriculture. This is the challenge now facing the profession.

REFERENCES

1. ALA Committee on Federal Relations, "Libraries and Federal Aid," *ALA Bulletin*, 30:425-471; p. 455.
2. Ibid., p. 457.
3. Ibid., p. 459.
4. Ibid., p. 458.
5. Leigh, Robert D. *The Public Library in the United States*. New York, Columbia University Press, 1960, p. 156.
6. Daniel, Hawthorne. *Public Libraries for Everyone*. Garden City, N.Y., Doubleday, 1961, p. 39.
7. U.S. Congress. Senate Committee on Labor and Public Welfare. *Library Services Act* (Senate Committee Report No. 2067 to accompany H.R. 2840). 84th Cong., 2nd Sess., May 29, 1956, p. 2.
8. U.S. Office of Education, Library Services Branch. "The Library Services and Construction Act (P.L. 88-269)." In *The Bowker Annual of Library and Book Trade Information, 1965*. Phyllis B. Steckler, ed. New York, R.R. Bowker, 1965, p. 165.
9. *U.S. Statutes at Large*, Public Law 89-511, Library Services and Construction Act Amendments of 1966. 89th Cong., 2nd Sess.
10. Becker, Joseph, ed. *Interlibrary Communication and Information Networks*. Chicago, American Library Association, 1972, p. 1.
11. U.S. *Statutes at Large*, Public Law 91-600, Library Services and Construction Act Amendments of 1970. 91st Cong., 2nd Session, Sec. 3(12).
12. Ibid., Sec. 6 (d) (4).
13. Becker, *op. cit.*, p. 4.
14. Ibid., p. 215.
15. "The Five Year Plan of the Illinois Regional Library Council, 1974-1979." In *Illinois Libraries*, 56:785, November 1974.

☆ U.S. GOVERNMENT PRINTING OFFICE: 1975 O—547-844